

Then you have a lot of Democrats who are complaining that the civic rules and customs—the filibuster has to go. They say it is a racist relic of the Jim Crow era.

I will acknowledge that some Democrats over the years used the filibuster to block civil rights progress, but I will also remind my Democratic colleagues that, yes, they used the filibuster hundreds of times in the last administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this letter written on April 7, 2017, persuasively authored by SUSAN COLLINS and CHRIS COONS and signed by more than 60 of our fellow Senators urging Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER to “preserve the existing rules, practices and traditions as they pertain to the right of Members to engage in extended debate on legislation.”

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2017.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Democratic Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER SCHUMER: We are writing to urge you to support our efforts to preserve existing rules, practices, and traditions as they pertain to the right of Members to engage in extended debate on legislation before the United States Senate. Senators have expressed a variety of opinions about the appropriateness of limiting debate when we are considering judicial and executive branch nominations. Regardless of our past disagreements on that issue, we are united in our determination to preserve the ability of Members to engage in extended debate when bills are on the Senate floor.

We are mindful of the unique role the Senate plays in the legislative process, and we are steadfastly committed to ensuring that this great American institution continues to serve as the world's greatest deliberative body. Therefore, we are asking you to join us in opposing any effort to curtail the existing rights and prerogatives of Senators to engage in full, robust, and extended debate as we consider legislation before this body in the future.

Sincerely,

Susan M. Collins, Orrin Hatch, Claire McCaskill, Lisa Murkowski, Christopher A. Coons, Joe Manchin, John McCain, Patrick Leahy, Roger F. Wicker, Luther Strange.

Angus S. King, Jr., Michael F. Bennett, Amy Klobuchar, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Martin Heinrich, John Boozman, Lindsey Graham, Richard Burr, Mark R. Warner, Jerry Moran, Roy Blunt, Marco Rubio, Jeanne Shaheen, Thom Tillis, Sherrod Brown, Shelley Moore Capito, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Brian Schatz, Michael E. Enzi, Dean Heller.

Cory A. Booker, Mazie Hirono, Dianne Feinstein, John Thune, Bill Cassidy, Heidi Heitkamp, Jeff Flake, Chuck Grassley, Maria Cantwell, Rob Portman.

Lamar Alexander, John Kennedy, John Tester, Thomas R. Carper, Pat Roberts, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tammy Duckworth, Jack Reed, Thad Cochran, Joe Donnelly.

Ben Sasse, Todd Young, Kamala D. Harris, Bill Nelson, Johnny Isakson, Edward J. Markey, Mike Lee, Debbie Stabenow, Sheldon Whitehouse, Robert Menendez, Tim Kaine.

Mr. COTTON. They note that these rules have changed on our Executive Calendar when we consider traditional nominees or executive branch nominees, but they say:

We are mindful of the unique role the Senate plays in the legislative process, and we are steadfastly committed to ensuring that this great [American] institution continues to serve as the world's greatest deliberative body. Therefore, we are asking you [Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL] to join us in opposing any effort to curtail the existing rights and prerogatives of Senators to engage in full, robust, and extended debate as we consider legislation before this body in the future.

Let me remind you, more than 60 Senators signed this. Twenty-six Democrats currently serving in the Senate signed it, 27 if you include the Vice President.

Let me just give you a few notables. As I said, the Vice President signed it. The following chairs of Senate committees signed this letter 4 short years ago: Senators LEAHY, WARNER, CANTWELL, CARPER, REED, STABENOW, and MENENDEZ. Some other notable Senators—as I said, it was authored by Senator COONS, one of Joe Biden's closest friends in the U.S. Senate. Senator KING, who often finds himself in the middle of consequential debates; Senator HEINRICH, who apparently has changed his tune and today is advocating aggressively to eliminate the filibuster, just like Senator SCHATZ; Senator BOOKER; Senator FEINSTEIN, one of the longest serving Democrats in the Senate; Senator KAINE, who was the Vice Presidential nominee for the Democratic Party in 2016; Senator TESTER, again, who often finds himself in the middle of consequential, bipartisan negotiations.

Yet, somehow, something has changed since 2017. Something has changed, and most of these Democratic Senators now think that the Senate rules must be destroyed so they can pass their massive power grab. What could it be that has changed? What could it be? I don't know. Maybe—maybe it is that Democrats have the most slender reed of power with Joe Biden in the White House and a 50–50 Senate and a four-seat majority in the House.

I wish my Democratic colleagues understood that the shoe can pinch when it is on the other foot.

NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER CHARLES FONZONE

Mr. President, Huawei is no ordinary phone company; it is the eyes and ears of the Chinese Communist Party. According to our Department of Defense, Huawei is a “Communist Chinese military company” that is controlled by the People's Liberation Army. A former officer in the PLA founded Huawei.

Huawei is built on stolen technology from American companies like Cisco, and it is engaged in espionage all around the world on behalf of its masters in Beijing, which raises some important questions.

Should American citizens work on behalf of a Communist Chinese military company? If they do, should they then go on to serve in senior positions in the U.S. Government, making policies that will directly affect our safety and security? These aren't academic questions. The Senate is now considering whether to confirm one Christopher Fonzone for a senior legal position in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

By all accounts, Mr. Fonzone is a capable lawyer. I don't question his qualifications or his character, but there is reason to question his judgment.

While working as a law partner at Sidley Austin, Mr. Fonzone performed legal work for Huawei, as well as China's Ministry of Commerce. He performed this work during a critical period when our government was actively exposing Huawei as a Chinese spy company and applying sanctions to it.

He also wasn't just a longtime lawyer in private practice with long-standing clients, to include foreign clients; he had spent most of his career in government, primarily in national security roles. I cannot imagine that he was not aware of the China threat in general or the Huawei threat in particular. After all, the House Intelligence Committee had produced a landmark report exposing Huawei in 2012, while he served in the Obama administration.

Now, I recognize he didn't do all that much work for Huawei—just a few billable hours here and there—but the fact remains that he first served Huawei, and now he wants to serve in the U.S. Government. Nor is he willing to foreclose the possibility of working for such companies in the future.

Unfortunately, Mr. Fonzone is far from alone in his lapse of judgment. There is a rapidly revolving door in Washington, DC, that shuttles people in and out of government. Unfortunately, some of those people go on to work for companies with ties to the Chinese Government and its armed wing, the People's Liberation Army, after they cycle out of government. These individuals are part of what I call the new China lobby. They work at white-shoe law firms, sprawling multinational corporations, and big banks. Their pockets are lined with Chinese Communist cash, just like Hollywood executives and NBA stars and ivory tower academics. Some of them get very rich by doing Beijing's bidding, and they don't want the gravy train to stop.

Consider a recent article in the Financial Times, which reported that some of the richest banks and investment firms in America had been forming partnerships with Chinese state-run banks. Similarly, some of America's biggest companies, like Nike and Coca-Cola, are so addicted to access to the Chinese market that they lobbied last year against a bill to crack down on goods made by slave labor—all because that bill would make it more difficult for Coke and Nike to make their

products in China and to keep access to the Chinese market.

At the same time as our country wages a cold war against the Chinese Communist Party, some of our best and brightest are taking their talents—King James, LeBron James, who is up to his ears in Chinese cash—to work for companies that are little more than puppets of the Chinese state.

That is deeply troubling, and it is high time the U.S. Senate take a stand against the China lobby. That is why I will, regrettably, oppose Mr. Fonzzone's nomination. Although he is far from the worst offender, it is time we start drawing a line, and in the future, I will therefore carefully scrutinize nominees for ties to the regime in Beijing and military companies like Huawei.

If you wish to serve in the U.S. Government in the future, let me be very clear: Do not do business with the Chinese Communist Party or its military or the companies that support it. Stop it today. Don't take the work. Don't take the meeting. Don't cash the check.

A man cannot serve two masters. It is as true today as it was in the old days.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators RUBIO, PETERS, and I be allowed to complete our remarks before the scheduled rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF KIRAN ARJANDAS AHUJA

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about those things that unite us as Americans, and I am here to talk about those things that divide us.

For centuries, public service has been something that unites Americans, drawing us together. Citizens from all walks of life serve in our military. They serve in Federal and State and local governments. They serve in police units and in fire departments across our country. They serve as teachers and coaches. And we as a nation are better off for their service and for their sacrifice.

Those who serve our Nation do it not because they have to but because they want to. They do it because they believe this Nation is worth serving. They do it because they believe this Nation is worth defending. They believe it is worth celebrating. And they are right to think all of those things. Service to this country is an act of selflessness that affirms our Nation is a place worth believing in.

But I am concerned that the present administration and this President, President Joe Biden, do not share this point of view. I am worried that President Biden is nominating for Federal office individuals who do not share a view of America as a good and decent place, who do not believe that the his-

tory of this Nation is worth celebrating; nominating, instead, people who believe that this is a country founded in racism and shot through with corruption.

Many of these nominees are partisans of a viewpoint that goes by different names but shares several features in common—a view that America is a systemically racist place and systemically unjust; a view of America as corrupt; a view of American society as one that needs to be deconstructed, that needs to be pulled apart, torn down, and then rebuilt in a fundamentally different way.

Now, this broad ideology has become known in public as critical race theory or sometimes just critical theory. And let me tell you, as someone who has taught in our Nation's universities, someone who has seen our institutions of higher learning up close, I would say to those in the media and elsewhere who now deny that there is any such thing as critical theory, that critical theory is, in fact, very real, it is very influential, and it appears to have become the animating ideology of this administration. That is cause for great concern.

Critical theory is an ideology that says the United States is rotten to its core. The leaders of this movement think our society is defined by White supremacy. They think our leaders are complicit, at best.

They think that all Americans are either oppressors or oppressed. In our world-class military, these critics see a vehicle for discrimination. In our American flag, they see propaganda. In our family businesses, they see White supremacy. In our police officers, they see agents of racial oppression.

These critics allow no room for merit, for experience, or for grace in our life together. They pit Whiteness and Blackness against each other in a manner that reduces every American, no matter their character or their creed, to their racial identity alone.

One of these critics, Dr. Ibram Kendi wrote this:

The only remedy to past discrimination is present discrimination. The only remedy to present discrimination is future discrimination.

That is right. That is what he said. Think about that for a moment. He is saying he is opposed to equality under the law. He is opposing our merit-based system for Federal employment. Dr. Kendi and his followers are in no uncertain terms advocating for State-sanctioned racism in the United States of America.

Now, it is a free country. Dr. Kendi and these other authors can write their books and debate their views and put them out in public. It is absolutely their right to do so. They are welcome to do so. But what we cannot allow—what we must not allow—is our Federal Government to affirm and sanction and advocate this critical race theory. We cannot allow the United States of America, the greatest Nation

on Earth, to legitimize a new era of racial engineering.

In the past few years, critical race theory has gained new prominence in the giant corporations, in the media, in the military, and even in our children's schools. We are seeing this across the country. We have seen too many of our children exposed to a curriculum like the 1619 Project and its derivatives that encourage division rather than unity, that rewrites our history in the service of an ideological agenda rather than in the service of truth.

Young children set off to school with eyes full of hope and hearts, full of pride in our country, only to be taught that White privilege defines the Nation, that subjects like mathematics are inherently racist, that the Christian faith is oppressive. They are taught that the nuclear family perpetuates racism.

Now, imagine for a moment if you were taught the same. Imagine if you were taught that your dreams were unjust or unfair, that your family were oppressors, that you were at fault for the problems of our society today. These are just children. We should be nurturing their dreams. We should be nurturing their hopes. We should be giving them a great hope for the future, for the future of this great Nation known as the United States of America, a hope for the future of the greatest Nation in the history of the world, rather than teaching them to mistrust their classmates and to distrust their own history.

It doesn't end there. Last year, we discovered that Federal agencies and other organizations funded by taxpayers were holding workplace training sessions where Federal employees were told that "virtually all White people contribute to racism"—that is a quote—or where civil servants were required to say that they "benefit from racism."

Now, President Trump put an end to this divisive curriculum, and he was right to do so. Workplace diversity training should focus on bringing people together, not on driving them apart. But under this new administration, I fear that critical theory is making a comeback.

In March, President Biden rescinded the former President's ban on this divisive curriculum, and now, he has nominated Kiran Ahuja to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management. That is a key position that runs human resources for the entire Federal Government and millions of its employees. Ms. Ahuja's nomination is before the Senate today. I am concerned that Ms. Ahuja is a disciple of radical theorists. She has frequently promoted Dr. Kendi. She called him a "thought leader" at her confirmation hearing back in April. Just last year, Ms. Ahuja wrote that we must free the Nation from the "daily trials of White supremacy." Those are her words.

She appeared to endorse Dr. Kendi's claim that the election of President